

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified patent application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-13 are in this case. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-12 have been rejected under § 103(a). Claims 2 and 13 have been objected to. Claims 2, 9-11 and 13 have been canceled. Independent claims 1 and 4 and dependent claim 5 have been amended.

The claims before the Examiner are directed toward a system and method for recording data in a multi-board solid-state storage system. The system includes a main board and several memory boards, each of which boards has primary and secondary non-volatile memory. The secondary memory of each board is used to store records of faulty locations of the board's primary memory.

### **§ 103(a) Rejections – Ajanovic '426 in view of Jeddeloh '798 and further in view of Okaue et al. '140**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 12 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ajanovic, US Patent No. 6,298,426 (henceforth, "Ajanovic '426") in view of Jeddeloh, US Patent No. 6,052,798 (henceforth, "Jeddeloh '798") and further in view of Okaue et al., US Patent No. 6,601,140 (henceforth, "Okaue et al. '140"). The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed below, claims 1 and 4 have been placed in condition for allowance by the inclusion therein of the limitations of claims 2 and 13, respectively. It follows that claims 5, 7, 8 and 12, that depend therefrom, also are allowable.

**§ 103(a) Rejections – Ajanovic ‘426 in view of Jeddeloh ‘798 and further in view  
of Gross et al. ‘959**

The Examiner has rejected claims 9-11 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ajanovic ‘426 in view of Jeddeloh ‘798 and further in view of Gross et al., US Patent No. 5,200,959 (henceforth, “Gross et al. ‘959”). The Examiner’s rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 9-11 have been canceled, thereby rendering moot the Examiner’s rejection of these claims.


**Objections**

The Examiner has objected to claims 2 and 13 as being based on rejected base claims. The Examiner has noted that claims 2 and 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

Claim 2 now has been rewritten in independent form by amending claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 2. Claim 13 now has been rewritten in independent form by amending claim 4 to include the limitations of claim 13. Correspondingly, claims 2 and 13 have been canceled, and sep iv of claim 5 has been renumbered as step vii.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 4, and hence dependent claims 5, 7, 8 and 12 are in condition for allowance. Prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark M. Friedman  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 33,883

Date: July 20, 2004